UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,009	07/18/2003	Michael Novak	MS#303011.1 (5057)	4582

321   7590   03/06/2007
SENNIGER POWERS
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER
PADMANABHAN, KAVITA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/06/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
10/623,009</td><td>Applicant(s)
NOVAK ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Kavita Padmanabhan</td><td>Art Unit
2161</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 December 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 July 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1.   Claims 1-18 are pending.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 3, and 9-18 have been amended.

3.   Claims 19-22 have been canceled.

4.   Claims 1-18 are rejected.

Claim Objections

5.   **Claims 9 and 18** are objected to because of the following informalities: All acronyms

should be spelled out in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   **Claims 3-7, 9, 12-15, and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 9 and 18 contain acronyms, but it is unclear what these acronyms mean (for

example, ASX and WSX). The applicant has amended the claims to recite "an advanced stream

redirector (ASX) source" and "a server-side playlist (WSX) source," which renders the claims

both unclear and inconsistent. The applicant states at page 7 of applicant's remarks that ASX is

an acronym for advanced stream redirector and that WSX is an acronym for server-side playlist.

While the former appears to be true, the latter clearly does not. Rather, WSX is simply an

example of a server-side playlist file, as noted in applicant's specification, par [0025].

Therefore, it is unclear whether ASX and WSX are intended by the applicant to serve as

examples or acronyms. If they intended as examples, that would also render the claim unclear in

that the metes and bounds of the claim would then be indefinite. Furthermore, it is still unclear

what DRM stands for.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "in the prioritized plurality of media file sources identified

as including metadata defining the property" at lines 5-6 of the claim. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. **Claim 12** includes a similar limitation and is

similarly rejected.

The examiner will apply prior art to this claim as best understood in light of the above

rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

9.   **Claims 10-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a test of whether the invention is categorized as a

process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter and if the invention produces a useful,

concrete and tangible result. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural

phenomena) are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a method claim to pass muster, the recited process must produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

In the instant case, **claims 10-18** recite a computer readable medium having instructions to perform a method, but the method does not appear to produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Regarding **claim 10**, merely retrieving a property does not constitute a tangible result. **Claims 11-18** are similarly nonstatutory.

The examiner will apply prior art to these claims as best understood, with the assumption that applicant will amend to overcome the stated 101 rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11.   **Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by **Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** (applicant's specification, par [0002] – par [0005], hereinafter "AAPA").

In regards to **claim 1**, **AAPA** teaches a method for retrieving a property of a media file being played via a media player, wherein the media file is retrieved from one of a plurality of media file sources, which are prioritized, comprising:

– querying each of the prioritized plurality of media file sources according to their priority to identify a source of the media file **(AAPA; par [0004], lines 1-2, 4; par [0005], lines 1-4;** *"metadata for a specific media file can be retrieved from a variety of sources"* **and** *"some existing systems employ a last writer wins approach when retrieving metadata to display for a media file."* **– since metadata can be retrieved from a plurality of sources, the sources are queried in order of their priority, i.e. last writer wins)**;

– displaying the property as defined by metadata of the identified source of the media file **(AAPA; par [0005], lines 1-4)**.

In regards to **claim 3**, **AAPA** teaches the method of claim 1,

– wherein querying includes querying each of the prioritized plurality of media file sources according to their priority to identify a property for the media file defined by the metadata of the source of the media file **(AAPA; par [0004], lines 1-2, 4; par [0005], lines 1-4; since metadata can be retrieved from a plurality of sources, the sources are queried in order of their priority, i.e. last writer wins)**, and

– wherein retrieving includes retrieving the property as defined by the metadata of a first source in the prioritized plurality of media file sources identified as including metadata defining the property **(AAPA; par [0005], lines 1-4)**.

In regards to **claim 4, AAPA** teaches the method of claim 3, wherein each media file source

corresponds to a metadata source **(AAPA; par [0004], lines 1-2, 4)**, and wherein querying

includes querying each of the metadata sources to identify the property for the media file

(AAPA; par [0005], lines 1-4).

Claims 10, 12, and 13 are rejected with the same rationale given for claims 1, 3, and 4,

respectively.

In regards to **claim 16, AAPA** teaches the computer readable storage medium of claim

10, wherein retrieving instructions determine the metadata source from which to retrieve the

property as a function of the property to be displayed **(AAPA; par [0005], lines 1-4).**

12.   **Claims 1-4 and 10-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Woodward et al. (2003/0036948, hereinafter "Woodward").

In regards to **claim 1, Woodward** teaches a method for retrieving a property of a media file

being played via a media player, wherein the media file is retrieved from one of a plurality of

media file sources, which are prioritized, comprising:

- querying each of the prioritized plurality of media file sources according to their priority

  to identify a source of the media file **(Woodward; par [0019]** - *"Audio file information

  retrieval is performed when a plugin (as described above) detects that a media player is

  playing an audio file"*; **par [0020]; par [0022]** - *"A lookup of a particular song is*

performed on the server software package using the collected information to locate the

best match--the most likely song--within a database"; par [0023] – *"If an exact match*

is not found, the database system and server software performs a match using

commonly known text-search techniques", "If a match is still not found, the database

system 120 and server software attempts to perform a match using sound-alike

techniques", "applies rules to determine the probability of correctness of each match,

and chooses the most probable");

- displaying the property as defined by metadata of the identified source of the media file (**Woodward; par [0017], lines 21-30; par [0023], lines 1-6**).

In regards to **claim 2**, **Woodward** teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising

retrieving the property defined by the metadata of the identified source of the media file when

the identified source defines the property, and retrieving the property defined by the source

having the highest priority below the identified source of the media file when the identified

source does not define the property (**Woodward; par [0020]; par [0023]**).

In regards to **claim 3**, **Woodward** teaches the method of claim 1,

- wherein querying includes querying each of the prioritized plurality of media file sources according to their priority to identify a property for the media file defined by the metadata of the source of the media file (**Woodward; par [0020]; par [0023]**), and

   –   wherein retrieving includes retrieving the property as defined by the metadata of a first source in the prioritized plurality of media file sources identified as including metadata defining the property (**Woodward; par [0023]**).

In regards to **claim 4, Woodward** teaches the method of claim 3, wherein each media file source corresponds to a metadata source (**Woodward; par [0023]**), and wherein querying includes querying each of the metadata sources to identify the property for the media file (**Woodward; par [0023]**).

Claims 10-13 are rejected with the same rationale given for claims 1-4, respectively.

In regards to **claim 16, Woodward** teaches the computer readable storage medium of claim 10, wherein retrieving instructions determine the metadata source from which to retrieve the property as a function of the property to be displayed (**Woodward; par [0017], lines 21-30; par [0023]**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15.   **Claims 5-7 and 14-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Woodward in view of Fowler et al. (US 6,493,436, hereinafter "Fowler").

In regards to **claim 5**, **Woodward** teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the priority for

querying each of the metadata sources is determined according to a predetermined importance

assigned to each of the plurality of metadata sources **(Woodward; par [0022]; par [0023] –**

rules are predetermined and they are what dictate importance/method of querying

sources). Woodward does not expressly teach the metadata source deemed most important

being queried first, and the metadata source deemed least important being queried last.

Woodward does not expressly teach a least important source being queried last. **Fowler** teaches

prioritizing sources, checking/querying the most desirable, which is equivalent to being deemed

the most important, source first, then the next most important, etc. until a suitable match is found

or the last source has been checked/queried **(Fowler; col. 2, lines 14-35)**. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to implement

the method of Woodward whereby the match probability rules of Woodward could be

implemented using the priority rules taught by Fowler, as a way of finding the best match for the

data **(Woodward, par [0022], par [0023]; Fowler, col. 2, lines 14-35)**.

In regards to **claim 6**, **Woodward and Fowler** teach the method of claim 5, wherein

querying includes issuing a chain of calls to each metadata source, wherein a first call is to the

metadata source deemed most important, and wherein a subsequent call is to the metadata source

deemed the next most important, and wherein a last call is to the metadata source deemed the

least **(Fowler; col. 2, lines 14-35)**.

In regards to **claim 7**, **Woodward and Fowler** teach the method of claim 6, wherein the

property to be displayed determines the metadata source from which to retrieve the property

(Woodward; par [0017], lines 21-30; par [0023]).

Claims 14-15 are rejected with the same rationale given for claims 5-6, respectively.

16.   **Claims 8 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **AAPA**

in view of Cato et al. (US 2003/0120928, hereinafter "Cato").

In regards to **claim 8**, **AAPA** teaches the method of claim 1. AAPA does not expressly

teach retrieving metadata from the metadata source that returns the property in the least amount

of time. **Cato** teaches, where there are multiple sources, retrieving the data from the source with

the fastest internet connection, i.e. that would return the data the fastest **(Cato; par [0115])**. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to implement the method taught by AAPA with the feature taught by Cato, whereby

the metadata would be retrieved from the source that is able to return the data the fastest in order

to provide the most time efficient service.

Claim 17 is rejected with the same rationale given for claim 8.

17.   **Claims 9 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **AAPA**

in view of Ramalay et al. (US 2002/0138619, hereinafter "Ramalay"), **further in view of Eyal**

et al. (US 2003/0033420, hereinafter "Eyal"), **further in view of Diamond et al.** (US

2002/0099694, hereinafter "Diamond"), **and further in view of Ijdens et al.** (US 2006/0090030,

hereinafter "Ijdens").

In regards to **claim 9, AAPA** teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the metadata

sources include a basic metadata source **(AAPA; par [0004], lines 1-2, 4)**. AAPA does not

expressly teach the metadata sources including an ASX source, a WSX source, a media library

source, a file header source, and a DRM source. **Ramalay** teaches an ASX file as a metadata

source **(Ramalay; par [0042], par [0094])**. **Eyal** teaches playlists that are stored on a server

module being a source of metadata **(Eyal; par [0110], par [0189])**. **Diamond** teaches metadata

in a media file header **(Diamond; par [0026])**, and since the media file comprises a media

library, metadata in a media file header also constitutes metadata from a media library source.

Ijdens teaches DRM data as a type of metadata **(Ijdens; par [0017])**. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to implement

the method described by AAPA with the various sources of metadata taught by Ramalay, Eyal,

Diamond, and Ijdens in order to allow a user to display a requested media file and customize the

media output based on the metadata retrieved from the metadata source **(Ramalay, par [0042],**

par [0094]; Eyal, par [0110], par [0189]).

      Claim 18 is rejected with the same rationale given for claim 9.

18.   **Claims 9 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Woodward in view of Ramalay, further in view of Eyal, further in view of Diamond, and

further in view of Ijdens.

      In regards to **claim 9**, **Woodward** teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the metadata

sources include a basic metadata source and a media library source **(Woodward; par [0017],**

lines 21-30; par [0019]; par [0020]; par [0023], lines 1-6). Woodward does not expressly

teach the metadata sources including an ASX source, a WSX source, a file header source, and a

DRM source. **Ramalay** teaches an ASX file as a metadata source **(Ramalay; par [0042], par**

[0094]). **Eyal** teaches playlists that are stored on a server module being a source of metadata

(Eyal; par [0110], par [0189]). **Diamond** teaches metadata in a media file header **(Diamond;**

par [0026]). **Ijdens** teaches DRM data as a type of metadata **(Ijdens; par [0017])**. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to

implement the method described by Woodward with the various sources of metadata taught by

Ramalay, Eyal, Diamond, and Ijdens in order to allow a user to display a requested media file

and customize the media output based on the metadata retrieved from the metadata source

(Ramalay, par [0042], par [0094]; Eyal, par [0110], par [0189]).

Claim 18 is rejected with the same rationale given for claim 9.

Response to Amendment

19.   Applicant's amendments filed 9/14/06 with respect to the objections to the specification

have been fully considered. The corresponding objections have been withdrawn accordingly.

20.   Applicant's amendments filed 9/14/06 with respect to the objections to the claims have

been fully considered. However, certain acronyms still have not been spelled out, such as

"DRM." Therefore, the objections have been maintained.

21.   Applicant's amendments filed 9/14/06 with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph

rejections have been fully considered. While the corresponding rejections of claims 2 and 11

have been withdrawn, the remaining rejections have been maintained, as explained above.

22.   Applicant's amendments filed 9/14/06 with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections have

been fully considered. However, the claims still do not appear to produce a tangible result, and

the rejections are therefore maintained, as explained above.

Response to Arguments

23.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/14/06 with respect to the prior art rejections of the claims

have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues at page 8 of applicant's remarks that AAPA does not teach *querying each* of the prioritized plurality of media file sources according to their priority to identify a source of the media file. The examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that AAPA meets the limitations of the claim, as presently recited. To clarify, the examiner asserts that AAPA recites "metadata for a specific media file can be retrieved from a variety of sources" and "some existing systems employ a last writer wins approach when retrieving metadata to display for a media file." The examiner asserts that this teaches querying the set of media file sources, i.e. all of, or each of, the sources, wherein the last version is given the highest priority and therefore is the one that is retrieved.

Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., automatically *designating a sequence* for querying each source) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The applicant also argues at page 8 of applicant's remarks that the AAPA discussion of the last writer wins approach teaches away from the claimed limitations. The examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that this argument is simply the applicant's interpretation of the last writer wins approach. The examiner asserts that the last writer wins approach is indeed a prioritized approach in which one source is selected from the set of media file sources based on its priority, i.e. it was the latest version. Moreover, the teachings of AAPA meet the limitations of the claim as written.

Applicant argues at page 9 of applicant's remarks that Woodward does not teach

querying each of the prioritized plurality of media file sources according to their priority to

identify a source of the media file. The examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that

Woodward meets the limitations of the claim as recited. Specifically, the applicant also argues

that the present invention discloses a system that provides an improved user experience when

retrieving metadata associated with various media files for display when the media files are

being played, whereas Woodward merely teaches assembling information and storing it in a

database. The examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the examiner notes that the features upon

which applicant relies (i.e., an improved user experience) are not recited in the rejected

claim(s). Furthermore, the examiner asserts that Woodward also teaches the metadata being

retrieved from the database for display when the media file is being played (Woodward; par

[0019] – *"Audio file information retrieval is performed when a plugin (as described above)*

detects that a media player is playing an audio file"; par [0022] – *"A lookup of a particular*

song is performed on the server software package using the collected information to locate the

best match--the most likely song--within a database"). The applicant also argues that the

teachings of Woodward are distinguishable from *querying each of the prioritized plurality of*

media file sources according to their priority to identify a source of the media file. In response,

the examiner asserts that Woodward teaches a prioritized approach in which an exact match is

given top priority and if such a match does not exist, the most probable match is selected

(Woodward; par [0023] – *"If an exact match is not found, the database system and server*

software performs a match using commonly known text-search techniques", *"If a match is still*

not found, the database system 120 and server software attempts to perform a match using

sound-alike techniques", "applies rules to determine the probability of correctness of each match, and chooses the most probable "). These teachings clearly meet the limitations of the claim, as presently recited.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In the present case, the examiner asserts that Woodward does indeed teach querying each of the prioritized plurality of media file sources according to their priority to identify a source of the media file, as discussed above, and Fowler teaches prioritizing sources, checking/querying the most desirable, which is equivalent to being deemed the most important, source first, then the next most important, etc. until a suitable match is found or the last source has been checked/queried (Fowler; col. 2, lines 14-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to implement the method of Woodward whereby the match probability rules of Woodward could be implemented using the priority rules taught by Fowler, as a way of finding the best match for the data (Woodward, par [0022], par [0023]; Fowler, col. 2, lines 14-35). Therefore, the examiner asserts that the motivation to combine the references is found not only in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention, but also in the references themselves. Furthermore, in response to applicant's arguments against the references

individually, namely that Fowler does not teach metadata retrieval, the examiner notes that one

cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based

on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In

re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

24.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

25.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Kavita Padmanabhan** whose telephone number is **571-272-

8352**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kavita Padmanabhan   February 28, 2007
Assistant Examiner
AU 2161
KP.
***